

With very few exceptions this space is filled in the geometrical period with a large circle, which in the smaller examples is simply foliated with four, but often with five, six, or eight foils, and in the larger ones, as in the Grantham east-light, and the east window of Lincoln Cathedral, filled with a group of smaller circles. In the curvilinear period this space is generally occupied with a figure of pointed oval form, the lower part of which, by being accommodated to the sides of the two main arches, assumes an ogee shape. When this centre piece contains, as in the larger geometrical windows, a group of smaller subordinate figures, the form and the foliation of these partake of the character of the rest of the work, and exhibit more or less of the ogee.

To return, however, to the Lincoln and Ely Cathedrals; the windows in both the geometrical and the curvilinear building are designed in accordance with the types we have been considering: in the former the foliated circle, supported by simple pointed arches, is the principal ornament of the window-brad; in the latter the wavy form of the ogee prevails, and the mullions are no longer adorned with the small shafts and capitals which are so conspicuous an ornament of the earlier example, but the mouldings of the tracery bars are continued down to the sill.

Before we leave this part of the subject I must again notice the noble east window, which, although imperfect as it perhaps may be in the arrangement of some of its details, is still so remarkable a feature of this work. Its design appears to have been formed on the simplest principle, namely, that of a circle carried by two arches. The key to the whole design is, therefore, given in the first pair of lights, as in the example already described.

I fear that I may appear to have dwelt too long on this most interesting and essential feature of the two periods, and will hasten now to consider the other points of the exterior of the three buildings in question.

The buttresses are the next important features: in the lancet example they are broad and bulky, but of equal projection from top to bottom, and are finished with a large sharp-pointed pediment: they are relieved on the face with a chamfer at each corner, and string courses. Each of these lower buttresses carries two flying buttresses, one under and the other above the roof of the side aisle.

In the curvilinear example the buttress is plain below, and its width is much reduced in comparison with its depth, which is also considerably reduced as it rises by successive stages of set-off: its upper part is faced with an elegant canopied panel; and it carries instead of the heavy pediment, a square pinnacled pinnacle, ornamented with crockets, and a final of curvilinear foliage.

The geometrical buttress lies midway between these two designs; its breadth is somewhat reduced, but it preserves the same projection from top to bottom: it is panelled and ornamented with figures, with pedestals, and canopies. It also retains the pedimental top, on the angles of which appears, for the first time, a stiff crocket, and on the top a final of rich and advanced foliage.

The cornice and parapet do not present very striking points of contrast: in the lancet one a few deep mouldings form the cornice. The parapet and coping arc, as is usual, perfectly plain in the geometrical one: the lower parapet has simply the addition of trefoiled corbel table. The upper one is more characteristic: it has good mouldings and a deep hollow, in which are placed large leaves of good foliage for its cornice, and a singular incised quatfoil on its parapet.

The curvilinear example shows a broad hollow in the cornice, filled with a large broad leaf and a plain parapet.

We will now turn to the interiors. Here the characteristic features are much more strongly marked. We have, in the background, the plain lancets in the nave as before, improved in the clerestory by the tall banded shafts which come down in front of the passage to the top of the triforium. We have also the same tracery in the curvilinear example; but in the presbytery of Lincoln we find a second plane of rich geometrical tracery in front of the clerestory window, of extreme beauty and excellent proportion, with clustered shafts of rich foliated capitals, and a deeply moulded

arch. In the curvilinear example, in place of this tracery, a series of small foliated arches is carried round this inner arch.

In the piers, the geometrical example corresponds with the lancet one, in having its shafts banded, in which respect they both differ from the curvilinear example, which is, as is usual in the style, plain. The plan of these piers deserves attention. The shafts in a lancet pier are usually arranged in a circle, round the central mass, whilst those of a curvilinear pier are more frequently arranged in the form of a diamond.

In the geometrical example, however, a form is taken which may certainly be said to be midway between the two. The centres of the shafts lie in the sides of a spherical square, set diamond-wise. By a spherical square, I mean a square the sides of which are curved slightly outwards.

There are three other points of slight difference between them: in the lancet example, the shafts are all pointed with a fillet; in the geometrical this fillet is altered into an elegant rounded point, which, although to be found in lancet work, is much more common and characteristic of the following period: the curvilinear pier has no such projection. It consists of four large shafts, with mouldings in the intervals, and has the ogee profile amongst them.

The pier arches of the lancet and geometrical have, in elevation, no strong marks of distinction: in the curvilinear the large flat leaf again appears in two orders of the arch.

The spandrels over the pier arch are plain in the lancet example, marked with a tee-foil in the geometrical one, and entirely occupied in the curvilinear example by what may be termed, according to Professor Willis, a trifoliated trefoil.

There is, perhaps, no feature in the interior of a building which exhibits, in a more characteristic manner, the period to which the building belongs, than the triforium. This remark particularly applies to the three examples before us, and, although it is true, that a prominent triforium is rarely found in the curvilinear period, and that its importance was greatly diminished even before the close of the geometrical period, and, although, in the case of Ely choir, we owe this beautiful example to the accidental circumstance, that the portion of the building in which it occurs was a curvilinear adaptation to an earlier building, still this does not lessen the value of the example before us, or its usefulness in enabling us to judge of the manner in which such a subject would be treated in curvilinear times. The history of architecture through three periods is written, in fact, in their three triforia. We have first the three plain lancets combined under one arch, with the solid spandrel above, pierced only by three quatrefoils. We next have the double geometrical arch, containing a quatrefoliated circle, carried by two trifoliated arches, the whole of the spandrels pierced entirely through, and the entire space thus converted into a traceried opening. We, lastly, have in the succeeding period this opening treated in true curvilinear style, and fitted with a most elegant panel of elaborate flowing tracery.

Having ascended to the triforium, and having already viewed the clerestory, we will take our last rapid survey of the building from this point, and a more instructive point of view in most buildings, is seldom to be found, although it is not often visited.

At the first glance, the spirit of the three periods is plainly apparent: in the lancet example we have acuteness, loftiness, verticality, if I may be allowed the term, in the pitch of the roof, in the vaulting, in the shape of the windows and arcades; and on the outside in a still more striking manner: in the pediments of the buttresses, and in every feature, we see this piercing form.

In the geometrical example a great change appears: here the circle, the simplest of all geometrical figures, appears predominant: in the clerestory, the triforium, the side aisles, and the arcades it is the ruling feature: its repetition in each of their situations is, indeed, striking; it may certainly be said to be the characteristic feature of the design.

Again, in the curvilinear example, in the very same positions where we had, in the first instance, lancet, and in the second circular

forms, we have the undulating outline of the ogee.

The contrast is perfect and undeniable, and the characteristics of the three styles, even at the first glance in their three examples, distinct and unmistakable: if we were to examine the details, the foliage, the sculpture, the profiles of the mouldings, and other minutiae, which are not such evident, but not less certain, indications of style and character, we should find the marks of distinction as clear and definite as in the more palpable parts of the design of these buildings.

E. SHARPE.

AWARDS OF OFFICIAL REFEREES.

DIVISION OF BUILDINGS.

IN the case of Mr. Hillier, the owner of a second-rate dwelling-house, No. 9, Robert-street, and a third-rate warehouse, situated in Thomas-street, and adjoining northwards to the said dwelling-house, and connected and occupied with the last, both in the district of St. George, Hanover-square, the owner desired to stop up the whole of the openings now existing in the wall dividing the said buildings originally two distinct houses, so as that such two buildings shall cease to be united, —the district surveyor objected to this being done, on the ground that the wall in the two lowermost stories was not of the full thickness prescribed by the statute for party-walls of buildings of the second-rate of the first-class. The owner also desired to alter the situation of the area belonging to the said warehouse, and to form an area in the centre of the said warehouse, instead of the present area on the south side of it, and to use such warehouse as a dwelling-house; and to this the said district surveyor also objected, on the ground that the area would be an area to an underground room or cellar of a dwelling-house, and ought to be built in accordance with the rules of schedule K of the first-mentioned Act.

The referees awarded—First. As to the wall between the said two buildings.—That inasmuch as the said two buildings were built as separate and distinct buildings, each having a separate entrance and staircase, and the said wall was built before the 1st day of January, 1845, as a party-wall between two buildings, and was carried up as such above the roofs adjoining thereto, it will not be contrary to the Metropolitan Buildings Act to stop up the openings which have been made in the said wall with brickwork of the full thickness of the wall (such brickwork being set in cement, and bonded to the old work by drawing the bricks in the joints of the said openings, to the satisfaction of the district surveyor, and thereupon to occupy such two buildings as two separate buildings. Secondly, as to any area to the said warehouse building, that unless it be intended to use any underground room or cellar of the said warehouse building as a separate building, it will not be necessary to make the area thereof 3 feet in width and otherwise, as prescribed by the said Act for the area of underground rooms or cellars so to be used.

(Costs to be paid by the owner.)

PROJECTIONS BEFORE THE LINE OF FRONTS.

Mr. Freeth, builder, had commenced the erection of a projecting building on the forecourt of one of a row of eight houses, known as St. John's Wood Terrace, in the district of Marylebone, Messrs. Fry, the owners of two detached houses, separated from this row by Edward-street, objected to the projection as injurious to them and contrary to the Act, and brought the matter before the referees.

The district surveyor considered that, as it was proposed to add like projected buildings to all the other eight houses, such general building would constitute a new line of front, and therefore that the building in dispute would not be contrary to the Act.

The builder Freeth took the following exceptions to the jurisdiction of the official referees upon the said requisition:—

First, that there is no case of doubt, difference, or dissatisfaction, in respect of the matter mentioned in the requisition, between any parties concerned, or between any party and the surveyor of the district,—the said William Hillier Fry and George William Fry, not being parties concerned within the meaning